Remarks

Claims 1-56 are pending in the application. Reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

The non-final Office Action dated October 11, 2007 lists the following rejections: claims 1-4, 8-18, and 22-56 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Cote *et al.* (U.S. Patent Pub. 2004/0234250) in view of Binford, Jr. *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,285,405); and claims 5-7 and 19-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Cote *et al.* in view of Binford, Jr. *et al.* and further in view of Takehiko *et al.*(U.S. Patent No. 6,741,795).

Applicant respectfully traverses the § 103(a) rejections of claims 1-28 (each of with is based upon Cote in view of Binford) because the cited portions of the Binford reference do not correspond to the claimed invention which includes, for example, aspects directed to a user manually reducing the time rate of displaying one of the first and second signals being displayed in order to synchronize the signals. The Office Action acknowledges that the Cote reference does not teach a user manually reducing the time rate of displaying one of the signals. In an attempt to address this deficiency, the Office Action cites to portions of the Binford reference that teach, in relation to Binford's admitted prior art, allowing a user to set delay values for an audio signal using a system configuration property sheet. *See, e.g.,* Col. 4:16-19. However, Binford teaches that the delay values are constant (or static) and the user cannot adjust the set delay values during a video conference. *See, e.g.,* Col. 1:50-67. Thus, Binford's user cannot adjust the delay value of the audio signal while the audio and video data streams are being displayed on the display (*i.e.,* the user cannot manually adjust the time rate of displaying one of the signals while the signals are being dsplayed as in the claimed invention). In an effort to facilitate prosecution, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 15 to expressly recite that which was implicitly present in these claims (*i.e.,* that the user manually adjusts the time rate of displaying one of the signals while the signals are displayed on the display). As such, these amendments are not intended to change the scope of the claims. Accordingly, the § 103(a) rejections of claims 1-28 are improper and Applicant requests that they be withdrawn.

Applicant further traverses the § 103(a) rejection of claims 2 and 16 because the cited portions of the Binford reference are unrelated to the claimed invention which

includes aspects directed to a user manually directing a delay compensation circuit to reduce the time rate of displaying one of the signals. In the cited portions of Binford (*i.e.*, video codec 204 and audio codec 212 of Figure 2, and Col. 5:44-49), which teach automatically introducing the delay measured in video codec 204 into the audio encoding/decoding routines in audio codec 212, there is no manual involvement by the user. *See, e.g.,* Col. 2:1-11 and Col. 5:44-49. Accordingly, the § 103(a) rejection of claims 2 and 16 is improper and Applicant requests that it be withdrawn.

Applicant further traverses the § 103(a) rejection of claims 4 and 18 because the cited portions of the Binford reference do not correspond to aspects of the claimed invention directed to the manually reducing the time rate of display of one of the signals not involving introducing a time delay gap. The cited portions of Binford discuss the first two steps (300 and 302) involved in measuring the video encoding delay. *See, e.g.,* Figure 3 and Col. 5-10. Applicant submits that these portions are unrelated to the aspects claimed in claims 4 and 18. Thus, the Office Action fails to provide correspondence between the cited references and claims 4 and 18. Accordingly, the § 103(a) rejection of claims 4 and 18 is improper and Applicant requests that it be withdrawn.

Applicant further traverses the § 103(a) rejection of claims 14 and 28 because the cited portions of the Cote reference do not correspond to aspects of the claimed invention directed to receiving the first and second signals as a multiplexed signal. The cited portions of Cote teach that the video signal and the audio signal are received separately by recognized voice source formatting unit 312. *See, e.g.,* Figure 16 and paragraph 0157. Cote's video and audio signals are multiplexed together since the video and audio signals are received as separate signals. Accordingly, the § 103(a) rejection of claims 14 and 28 is improper and Applicant requests that it be withdrawn.

Applicant respectfully traverses the § 103(a) rejections of claims 29-53 because the cited portions of the Cote reference do not correspond to the claimed invention which includes, for example, aspects directed to the first signal having a first plurality of time stamps originating from the source and the second signal having a second plurality of time stamps originating from the source. The Office Action erroneously asserts that Cote's related time codes correspond to the claimed first and second pluralities of time stamps. In actuality, the cited portions of Cote teach that speech recognition module 310

generates the recognized voice source signal with the related time codes. *See, e.g.,* Figure 16 and paragraph 0157. Cote does not teach that the video source signal has any related time codes. Thus, Cote's video source signal does not correspond to either of the first or second signals of the claimed invention. Moreover, Cote's audio source signal that is provided from audio/video source 300 does not have any related time codes. As such, Cote's audio source signal does not correspond to either of the first or second signals of the claimed invention, which each have respective pluralities of time stamps that originate from the source. Accordingly, the § 103(a) rejection of claims 29-53 is improper and Applicant requests that it be withdrawn.

Applicant further traverses the § 103(a) rejections of claims 29-53 because the Office Action does not provide sufficient detail regarding the proposed combination of the Cote and Binford references to enable Applicant to determine how the Office Action is proposing to modify the Cote reference. The cited portions of Binford are directed toward the synchronization of audio and video signals that require different amounts of time to code/decode and transmit over a network 114 between various endpoints. *See, e.g.,* Col. 2:1-11 and Col. 4:40-50. Binford measures the actual video encoding and video decoding delay and introduces the measured delay in the audio encoding and audio decoding routines. *See, e.g.,* Col. 5:44-49. In contrast, the cited portions of Cote are directed to Karaoke generating and these portions of Cote do not mention any encoding/decoding of audio and video signals or any data transmission over a network between endpoints as in Binford. The Office Action has not provided any detail regarding how these seemingly unrelated teachings of Cote and Binford are to be combined. Without such an explanation, Applicant is unable to determine the propriety of the proposed combination. Accordingly, the § 103(a) rejection of claims 29-53 is improper and Applicant requests that it be withdrawn. Should any rejection be maintained based upon the Cote and Binford references, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office Action provide clarification regarding how the Office Action is proposing to combine the seemingly unrelated teachings of these references.

Applicant notes that minor amendments have been made to claims 29 and 31 to improve readability. For example, time-synchronize has been replaced with time-synchronized and unnecessary reference characters have been removed. These

amendments are not being made to overcome any of the rejections raised by the Office Action, which fails for the reasons discussed above.

In view of the remarks above, Applicant believes that each of the rejections has been overcome and the application is in condition for allowance. Should there be any remaining issues that could be readily addressed over the telephone, the Examiner is asked to contact the agent overseeing the application file, John Rehberg, of NXP Corporation at (408) 474-9061 (or the undersigned).

Please direct all correspondence to:

Corporate Patent Counsel
NXP Intellectual Property & Standards
1109 McKay Drive; Mail Stop SJ41
San Jose, CA 95131

CUSTOMER NO. 65913

By: _____
Name: Robert J. Crawford
Reg. No.: 32,122
651-686-6633
(NXPS.363PA)